READY FOR DECLARATION - M. Caroff(7) NTERFERENCE INITIAL MEMORA IN	2/47
--	------

BOARD OF PATENT APPEAL AND INTERFERENCES: An interference is sound to ex This interference involves parties PATENT NO. IF ANY FILING DATE : 5462.983 03/017, 563 9/27/93 etal BLOEM BERGEN Maintenance fees not due If application has been patented, have maintenance fees been paid? "Accorded the benefit of: IISSUE DATE, IF ANY FILING DATE SERIAL NO COUNTRY The claim(s) of this party which correspond(s) to this count is(are) UNPATENTABLE CLAIMS PATENTABLE CLAIMS The claim(s) of this party which does(do) not correspond to this count is(are) UNPATENTABLE CLAIMS PATENTABLE CLAIMS ISSUE DATE IF ANY PATENT NO. IF ANY FILING DATE SERIAL NO. PARTY 12/30 194 08/367 370 RIMSA If application has been patented, have maintenance fees been paid? Accorded the benefit of: ISSUE DATE, IF ANY PATENT NO., IF ANY FILING DATE SERIAL NO. COUNTRY ::<del>-</del> 07/995,237 192 07/957924 (A) 'n The claim(s) of this party which correspond(s) to this count is(are):
PATENTABLE CLAIMS UNPATENTABLE CLAIMS 86 - 99 The claim(s) of this party which does(do) not correspond to this count is(are):
UNPATENTABLE CLAIMS PATENTABLE CLAMS Instructions 1. For every patent involved in the interference, check if the fees have been paid by using the patent number with the PALM screen If fees are due and they have not been paid, the interference cannot be declared since it would invovive an expired patent. (35 USC 135(a); 37 CFR 1.606). 2. For each party, separately identify the patentable and unpatentable claims which correspond to the count. (37 CFR 1.601 (f), 1.601 (n), 1.609(b)(2)). 3. For each party, separately identify the patentable and unpatentable claims which do not correspond to the count (37 CFR 1.609(b)( Forward all files including those the benefit of which is being accorded. 5. Keep a copy of the Interference Initial Memorandum and any attachments for your records. All information requested below must be attached on (a) separate sheet(s) and type-written. 6. On a separate sheet, set forth a single proposed interference count. If any claim of any party is exactly the same word for word

as this count, please indicate the party, application or patent number, and the claim number.

7 For each claim designated as corresponding to the count, provide an explanation of why each claim defines the same patentable invention (37 CFR 1.609(b)(2)).

8. For each claim designated as not corresponding to the count, provide an explanation of why each claim defines a separate patentable invention (37 CFR 1.609(b)(3)).

9. For each additional count, if any, repeat steps 2-6 and, additionally, provide an explanation why each count represents a

separate patentable invention from every other count (37 CFR 1.609(b)(1)). ART UNIT TELEPHONE NO 1501 308-2395 \_ Co 5 61 RECTOR SIGNATURE (if requ DATE

"The serial number and filing date of each application the benefit of which is intended to be accorded must be listed. It is not sufficient to merely list the earliest application if there are intervening applications necessary for continuity

THIS PAGE CAN BE DUPLICATED IF THERE ARE MORE THAN TWO INTERFERING PARTIE

(1)

## Proposed Interference Count

Count 1

1. A moldable composition comprising a compatible thermoplastic blend of a biodegradable, predominately amorphous, hydrophobic, water-repellant, starch ester having a degree of substitution of about 1.0 to about 2,5DS and a biodegradable polyester selected from the group consisting of poly (\(\epsilon\)-captology (\(\epsilon\)-captology (lactic acid) or polylactide, poly (glycolic acid) or polyglycolide, poly (hydroxybutyric acid), poly (hyroxybutyric acid), poly (hyroxybutyric acid), poly (hydroxybutyric acid), poly (hydroxybut

M/C 1/2/97

## Serial No. 08/367,370

Claim 86	It would have been obvious to use the molding composition in the count to make
	products conventionally prepared from starch esters and polyesters such as
	film.
Claim 87	It would have been obvious to select known starches for use in preparing the
	starch ester in the composition of the count.
Claim 88	It would have been obvious to select known starches for use in preparing the
	starch ester in the composition of the count.
Claim 89	It would have been obvious to use a starch ester having a degree of substitution
	within the range recited in the count.
Claim 90	It would have been obvious to select known starches for use in preparing the
	starch ester in the composition of the count.
Claim 91	It would have been obvious to use an art recognized plasticizer for starch esters
	and polyesters for its intended purpose in the composition of the count.
Claim 92	It would have been obvious to use an art recognized plasticizer for starch esters
	and polyesters for its intended purpose in the composition of the count.
Claim 93	The claim is drawn to a composition that is essentially the same as the count.
Claim 94	It would have been obvious to select known starches for use in preparing the
	starch ester in the composition of the count.
Claim 95	It would have been obvious to use an art recognized filler for starch esters and
•	polyesters for its intended purpose in the composition of the count.
Claim 96	It would have been obvious to use the molding composition in the count to make
	products conventionally prepared from starch esters and polyesters.
Claim 97	It would have been obvious to use the molding composition in the count to make
	products conventionally prepared from starch esters and polyesters using
	conventional molding steps of heating and shaping.
Claim 98	It would have been obvious to select known starches for use in preparing the
	starch ester in the composition of the count.
Claim 99	It would have been obvious to use an art recognized plasticizer for starch esters
	and polyesters for its intended purpose in the composition of the count.

Claim 1	It would have been obvious to use the molding composition in the count to make
	products conventionally prepared from starch esters and polyesters such as
	film.
Claim 2	It would have been obvious to select known starches for use in preparing the
	starch ester in the composition of the count.
Claim 3	It would have been obvious to select known starches for use in preparing the
	starch ester in the composition of the count.
Claim 4	It would have been obvious to use a starch ester having a degree of substitution
	within the range recited in the count.
Claim 5	It would have been obvious to select known starches for use in preparing the
	starch ester in the composition of the count.
Claim 6	It would have been obvious to use an art recognized plasticizer for starch esters
	and polyesters for its intended purpose in the composition of the count.
Claim 7	It would have been obvious to use an art recognized plasticizer for starch esters
	and polyesters for its intended purpose in the composition of the count.
Claim 8	The claim is drawn to a composition that is essentially the same as the count.
Claim 9	It would have been obvious to select known starches for use in preparing the
	starch ester in the composition of the count.
Claim 10	It would have been obvious to use an art recognized filler for starch esters and
	polyesters for its intended purpose in the composition of the count.
Claim 11	It would have been obvious to use the molding composition in the count to make
	products conventionally prepared from starch esters and polyesters.
Claim 12	It would have been obvious to use the molding composition in the count to make
	products conventionally prepared from starch esters and polyesters such as
	film using a conventional film forming process.
Claim 13	It would have been obvious to use the molding composition in the count to make
	products conventionally prepared from starch esters and polyesters using
	conventional molding steps of heating and shaping.